



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,460	08/04/2006	David Naccache	1032326-000404	5746

21839 7590 03/29/2010
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

VAUGHAN, MICHAEL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2431

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

03/29/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com
offserv@bipc.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/588,460	Applicant(s) NACCACHE, DAVID	
	Examiner MICHAEL R. VAUGHAN	Art Unit 2431	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The instant application having Application No. 10/588460 is presented for examination by the examiner. Claims 16-31 are pending. Claim 31 is new.

Response to Amendment

Claim Objections

Claim 31 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The term “an authentic biometric signature” should read as “the authentic biometric signature” because this entity was already defined in parent claim 16.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/25/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The following interpretation of the prior art is solely based on the current set of claims and arguments submitted by the Applicant. It is not the only possible interpretation of the prior art and may be altered when/if the claims and/or arguments change.

Applicant has alleged that the Yamaguchi reference fails to teach securing access to a piece of equipment. It is respectfully asserted that Yamaguchi was not relied upon to teach this feature. This feature is taught by Watanabe. Specifically it is the user device to which is being accessed (0337). In each of the embodiments, access

Art Unit: 2431

is sought by the user to use services provided by the user device. There is no need to incorporate the locking mechanisms taught by Yamaguchi.

The feature specifically relied upon from Yamaguchi is the fact that a computer can store encrypted biometric samples (0040 and 0046-48). This computer is operatively coupled to the biometric sampler. Watanabe teaches a computer operatively coupled to the biometric sampler and the secure IC card. The secure IC card performs the comparison between the encrypted biometric sample (IDC) and the sampled biometric input. Therefore it is obvious to send the encrypted biometric sample to the secure IC card. In fact, it is evident in this scenario that if one stores the encrypted biometric sample in the computer, it must be transmitted to the secure IC if the secure IC card is performing the comparison. Storing the encrypted biometric sample on the computer is obvious because Yamaguchi teaches many samples can be stored on a computer as it has relatively more storage space than an IC card.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the foregoing, the claimed invention is obvious in view of Watanabe and Yamaguchi.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP Application Publication 2002/0069361 to Watanabe et al., hereinafter Watanabe in view of USP Application Publication 2001/0036301 to Yamaguchi et al., hereinafter Yamaguchi.

As per claim 16, Watanabe teaches a method of securing access to a piece of equipment, the method comprising:

obtaining a reference datum for an authorized user, in an authentication medium, wherein said reference datum comprises at least an encrypted authentic biometric signature [IDC] (0356);

storing an encrypted version of said authentic biometric signature on said piece of equipment (0335);

acquiring, at a sensor, a plain biometric signature for a user requesting access to said piece of equipment (0357);

decrypting, in said authentication medium, said encrypted authentic biometric signature (0356);

verifying, in said authentication medium, the authenticity of said plain biometric signature by comparing said plain biometric signature of said user with said decrypted authentic biometric signature of an authorized user (0357); and

granting said user access to said piece of equipment if said comparison is successful and denying access if said comparison fails (0357). While Watanabe teaches many embodiments of securing access to a piece of equipment, he is silent in

Art Unit: 2431

explicitly disclosing a single embodiment teaching all of the above mentioned limitations combined with storing said encrypted authentic biometric signature on a piece of equipment and transmitted it to the authentication medium. Watanabe does teach storing the encrypted profile on computers in other embodiments. Moreover, Yamaguchi teaches that encrypted biometric templates are stored on a computer (see Figure 42 and paragraphs 0040 and 0044-46). Yamaguchi teaches hundreds of templates can be stored on a traditional computer database and hard drive. It is known that smart cards have limited memory. It is inherent that if the encrypted biometric sample is stored on the computer, and the IC card is performing the comparison, then the encrypted biometric sample must be sent to the IC card. In the cited Watanabe embodiment, the IC card obtains both the encrypted biometric sample and the input biometric sampling for authentication. The claim would have been obvious because combining known methods which produce similar results is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art. Watanabe teaches the encrypted biometric signature is decrypted in the smart card; the same result is achieved whether it was always stored there, or was retrieved from a computer database.

As per claim 21, Watanabe teaches a method of securing access to a piece of equipment, the method comprising:

creating a reference datum for an authorized user in an authentication medium, separate from said piece of equipment, wherein the creation of said reference datum (0198) comprises:

(i) inputting a personal identification code for said authorized user on a keyboard (0198 and 0248);

(ii) detecting, at a sensor, a plain authentic biometric signature for said authorized user (0198);

(iii) encrypting said plain authentic biometric signature by means of a private key (0198 and 0199);

(iv) sending said encrypted authentic biometric signature to said piece of equipment (0234);

(v) associating said personal identification code with said encrypted authentic biometric signature (0248); and

(vi) storing said encrypted authentic biometric signature and said associated personal identification code on said computer (0248);

receiving a personal identification code inputted on a keyboard (0248);

acquiring, at a sensor, a plain biometric signature of a user requesting access to said piece of equipment (0357); and

verifying the authenticity of said plain biometric signature for a user requesting access to said piece of equipment, wherein said verifying comprises:

(i) matching said personal identification code with an encrypted authentic biometric signature stored on said computer (0554);

(iii) decrypting said authentic biometric signature, on said authentication medium, by means of a private key on said authentication medium (0357);

(iv) comparing, on said authentication medium, said decrypted authentic biometric signature with said plain biometric signature of said user requesting access to said piece of equipment, to provide a comparison result (0357); and

(v) granting access to said user requesting access to said piece of equipment if said comparison result is successful and denying access if said comparison result fails (0357).

While Watanabe teaches many embodiments of securing access to a piece of equipment, he is silent in explicitly disclosing a single embodiment teaching all of the above mentioned limitations combined with storing said encrypted authentic biometric signature on a piece of equipment and transmitted it to the authentication medium. Watanabe does teach storing the encrypted profile on computers in other embodiments. Moreover, Yamaguchi teaches that encrypted biometric templates are stored on a computer (see Figure 42 and paragraphs 0040 and 0044-46). Yamaguchi teaches hundreds of templates can be stored on a traditional computer database and hard drive. It is known that smart cards have limited memory. It is inherent that if the encrypted biometric sample is stored on the computer, and the IC card is performing the comparison, then the encrypted biometric sample must be sent to the IC card. In the cited Watanabe embodiment, the IC card obtains both the encrypted biometric sample and the input biometric sampling for authentication. The claim would have been obvious because combining known methods which produce similar results is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art. Watanabe teaches the encrypted biometric

Art Unit: 2431

signature is decrypted in the smart card; the same result is achieved whether it was always stored there, or was retrieved from a computer database.

As per claims 17 and 22, Watanabe teaches said authentication medium is an electronic card (0356).

As per claims 18 and 23, Watanabe teaches said electronic card includes a decryption module (0356).

As per claims 19 and 24, Watanabe teaches said electronic card includes a comparison module, and said comparing is performed in said electronic card (0357).

As per claims 20 and 25, Watanabe teaches said electronic card further comprises an encryption module (0346 and 0352). Examiner supplies the same rationale as recited in the rejection of claim 16 to store the encrypted biometric signature on the computer.

As per claim 26, Watanabe teaches a device for securing access to a piece of equipment, comprising:

a storage device in said piece of equipment, for storing an encrypted authentic biometric signature (0336) and a corresponding personal identification code of an authorized user (0554);

a sensor for acquiring a plain biometric signature of a user requesting access to said piece of equipment (0357); and

an authentication medium having a controller, wherein said controller:

decrypts said authentic biometric signature by means of a secret key (0356); compares said decrypted authentic biometric signature with said plain biometric signature of said user requesting access to said piece of equipment, to provide a comparison result; and grants access to said user requesting access to said piece of equipment if said comparison is successful and denying access if said comparison fails (0357).

While Watanabe teaching many embodiments of securing access to a piece of equipment, he is silent in explicitly disclosing a single embodiment teaching all of the above mentioned limitations combined with receiving said encrypted authentic biometric signature from said storage device, associated with said personal identification code **in the authentication medium**. Watanabe does teach storing the encrypted profile on computers in other embodiments. Moreover, Yamaguchi teaches that encrypted biometric templates are stored on a computer associated with said piece of equipment (see Figure 42 and paragraphs 0040 and 0044-0046). Yamaguchi teaches hundreds of templates can be stored on a traditional computer database and hard drive. It is known that smart cards have limited memory. It is inherent that if the encrypted biometric sample is stored on the computer, and the IC card is performing the comparison, then the encrypted biometric sample must be sent to the IC card. In the cited Watanabe embodiment, the IC card obtains both the encrypted biometric sample and the input biometric sampling for authentication. The claim would have been obvious because combining known methods which produce similar results is within the capabilities of one of ordinary skill in the art. Watanabe teaches the encrypted biometric signature is

Art Unit: 2431

decrypted in the smart card; the same result is achieved whether it was always stored there, or was retrieved from a computer database.

As per claim 27, Watanabe teaches at least one computer for storing a plurality of encrypted authentic biometric signatures and a corresponding plurality of personal identification codes for a corresponding plurality of authorized users [inherent this registration process applies to more than one user; 0234], wherein said at least one computer:

Watanabe does not explicitly teaches delivering an encrypted authentic biometric signature to said authentication medium when receiving an access request from a user, such that said authentication medium is capable of providing a plurality of users secure access to said piece of equipment. Examiner supplies the same rationale for combining the feature of storing the signatures in a computer until the access attempt as taught by Yamaguchi and recited in claim 26.

As per claim 28, Watanabe teaches said authentication medium is an electronic card having a memory storing a secret key that cannot be read from outside [smart cards are known for their protected memory].

As per claim 29, Watanabe teaches an encryption module that encrypts an authentic biometric signature supplied in plain form to said sensor and delivers said encrypted authentic biometric signature to said at least one computer, in response to an

Art Unit: 2431

encryption command (0234). Examiner supplies the same rationale as recited in the rejection of claim 16 to store the encrypted biometric signature on the computer.

As per claim 30, Watanabe teaches said secret key is a private key having a matching public key, and wherein said encryption module is included in said at least one computer and uses said matching public key to encrypt authentic biometric signatures (0235).

As per claim 31, Watanabe teaches said piece of equipment includes an encryption module for encrypting an authentic biometric signature for storage in said piece of equipment (0228).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2431

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. VAUGHAN whose telephone number is (571)270-7316. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:30am - 5:00pm, EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on 571-272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/588,460
Art Unit: 2431

Page 13

/M. R. V./

Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/William R. Korzuch/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431